

A BETTER SOLUTION FOR THE TEXT OF XENOPHON, *SYMP.* 4. 37

It may be taken as a great verity of Greek syntax that *ἄν* is not construed with the present or the perfect of the indicative. Exceptions are either apparent, needing explanation, or errors in transmission, requiring correction. There are no discordant voices in the expert choir on this point, all say the same.¹ As usual the collections of examples are most copious in Kühner–Gerth, other authorities attempting only to adduce a few new examples. Since these are so readily available there is no need to review all the pertinent passages here. The apparent exceptions are either cases of confusing word-order or anacolutha. Confusing word-order occurs for example when *ἄν* attaches itself to a verb of speaking (*οἶμαι*), or to a negative when it belongs logically elsewhere in the sentence. The anacolutha are principally formulaic in character, as when *καὶν εἰ* is used simply as = *καὶ εἰ* and so brings an extra *ἄν* into the sentence which may seem to belong to an indicative. The errors in transmission include as one of the principal types those sentences in which *ἄν* is supposed to have been developed by a dittography. Since Xen. *Symp.* 4. 37 belongs, according to received opinion, to this category, it will be necessary to consider these examples in greater detail. They are not all equally convincing. Take for example

Plato, *Phil.* 15 c:

Ταῦτ' ἔστι τὰ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν καὶ πολλά, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνα, ᾧ Πρώταρχε, ἀπάσης ἀπορίας αἷτα μὴ καλῶς ὁμολογηθέντα καὶ εὐπορίας ἂν αὐ καλῶς.

I see no reason here with Badham, Burnet, and Stahl, 253, against the entire tradition, to excise *ἄν*, but prefer with Diès to retain it. I suppose that *αἷτια* is an anarthrotic substantive which stands predicatively to *ἐκεῖνα*,² and that the verbal feeling changes after *ἀλλ' οὐκ* to the potential optative with the value of a strong statement with subjective colour.³ In this way we would have to understand that *αἷτια* has the effect which could be made specific by the addition of *ἄν εἴη* and then similarly to supply *εἴη* once more with *ἄν*. *Ἄν* stands of course often as a sort of shorthand for *ἄν* with optative or past indicative verb forms which must be supplied out of the (not necessarily verbal) context.⁴

¹ Schwyzer, 2, 352: 'Weder bei Homer noch später sind Ind. Präs. (Perf.) . . . Modalpartikel anzuerkennen.' So also Gildersleeve–Miller, 433; Kühner–Gerth, 1. 210. 2; Goodwin, *Moods & Tenses*, 195; Stahl, 252–3.

² For such anarthrotic substantives used with pronouns predicatively, that is to say as the equivalents of new statements, and so more or less as the equivalents of new verbs, cf. KG 1. 628. 6 and especially J. E. Harry, 'The Omission of the Article with Substantives after οὗτος, ὅδε, ἐκεῖνος in Prose', *TAPA*, 1898, pp. 48–65.

³ Cf. Gildersleeve–Miller, 444: 'The optative with *ἄν* is often used in combination with the indicative, sometimes as a climax,

giving, as it does, the warmth of personal conviction.' This interchange of the indicative with the optative+*ἄν* is also mentioned in the somewhat misleading remark in KG 1. 235. 6. 1. The matter is discussed at greater length in chapter 17 of my Zürich Dissertation, '19 Kapitel zur Textkritik und Syntaktischen Theorie der Attischen Autoren' (to be published in January 1971).

⁴ Cf. KG 1. 243 f.; Gildersleeve–Miller, 458; Smyth–Messing, 1766; Krüger–Pökel, 1. 69. 7. 2: 'Fehlen kann das zu *ἄν* gehörige Verbum wenn das vorhergehende (sc. Verbum) (in der da stehenden oder in einer sinngemässen Form) zu ergänzen oder ein allgemeiner Begriff wie *εἴη, ποιότης, εἰποις* zu denken ist.'

Nevertheless there is a group of passages where explanation by dittography would seem to be acceptable, and Xen. *Symp.* 4. 37 has always been understood to be one of these. Cf.

Plato, *Apol.* 41 b:

καὶ δὴ τὸ μέγιστον, τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐξετάζοντα καὶ ἐρευνῶντα ὥσπερ τοὺς ἐνταῦθα διάγειν τίς [ἄν] αὐτῶν σοφός ἐστιν καὶ τίς οἴεται μέν, ἔστιν δ' οὐ.

(τίς αὐτῶν TY τίς ἄν αὐτῶν BW)

Xen. *de Venatione* 13. 1:

οὔτε γὰρ [ἄν] ἄνδρα που ἐοράκαμεν ὄντιν' οἱ νῦν σοφισταὶ ἀγαθὸν ἐποίησαν, οὔτε . . .

(γὰρ ἄν ἄνδρα codd. plur. γὰρ ἄνδρα A)

Xen. *Symp.* 4. 37:

'Εγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πόλλα ἔχω ὥς μόλις αὐτὰ καὶ ἐγὼ [ἄν] αὐτὸς εὕρισκω

(ἐγὼ ἄν αὐτὸς codd. plur. ἐγὼ αὐτὸς B)

What explanation is there for ἄν in any of these passages unless it is supposed to be construed with the indicative? Since moreover the manuscripts do vary in each case, at least one failing to show ἄν, and since a form follows ἄν in each case which makes dittography plausible, it might seem that an acceptable explanation has been reached for all these passages. It is only necessary to expunge the ἄν as a copyist's error, or to indicate its dubiety by enclosing it in brackets—the usual practice—and the problem has received acceptable solution.

This seems actually to be the best answer for the first two passages cited, Plat. *Apol.* 41 b and Xen. *de Venatione* 13. 1. But a new and better opportunity now opens up for the last citation of the three.¹ Professor François Ollier's edition, based on a new collation of some neglected manuscripts,² puts the whole problem in a different light. Ollier gives the passage as: 'Εγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πόλλα ἔχω ὥς μόλις αὐτὰ καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς [ἄν] εὕρισκω.

¹ This better opportunity is certainly not that of adopting the suggestion of Professor H. Erbse in his article 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Xenophon' in *Rheinisches Museum*, 103 (1960), pp. 157 ff. Erbse is a good Hellenist: he understands the context and knows that the passage is ironical in tone. He has moreover a valid point when he observes that one has the feeling that some precise intent or relationship of the collocation of pronouns ἐγὼ αὐτός, 'even I myself', escapes us. But when he goes on to pronounce that we must print ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πόλλα ἔχω, ὥς μόλις αὐτὰ καὶ ἐπιπλέον (ὥς) αὐτὸς εὕρισκω, that is, after all, really only a very wild stab. What Erbse seems not to understand is that it is one thing to feel insecure about the precise meaning of a turn of speech, and quite another thing simply to rewrite it arbitrarily.

² *Xenophon, Banquet—Apologie de Socrate, Texte établi et traduit par François Ollier*, Paris, 1961. Ollier, who speaks in the 'Notice' of his edition (p. 35) of the 'valeur de Q, qui avait été méconnue par les différents éditeurs du

Banquet' remarks in a footnote to this statement: 'J'ai moi-même revu entièrement les manuscrits Q et R grâce aux photographes qui m'ont été procurées par l'Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes.' I presume that Ollier's reading at this point is taken from one of his new sources. I find it nowhere else except, curiously enough, in Krüger's *Schullehre*, 1. 65. 3. 4. However, since Ollier does not specifically say so, it could be his own conjecture we have here—as for that matter the reading in Krüger could be *his* conjecture. If it is a conjecture it is a good one. But why, once they were about it, did Krüger and Ollier not go on and remove the brackets and write ἄν—as a prepositional prefix? Ollier surely would have mentioned the fact in his apparatus if he had simply undertaken to change the position of ἄν on his own account. On the other hand, the possibility of an identical misprint in Krüger and in Ollier seems remote. I therefore proceed on the assumption that the text which Ollier gives has some manuscript authority.

Now if this reading has any kind of warranty in the tradition at all it surely offers the best solution yet to the problem of what to do with the *άν*, which is impossible because it can only be construed with the present indicative. It is only necessary to consider *άν* here as a prepositional prefix and write the two words together as one. The modal particle disappears in that instant and only a present indicative remains. This particular type of correction is certainly nothing new. Precisely the same error occurs for instance at least twice in the Plato manuscripts.¹ So compare passages where some or all manuscripts show as *άν* an *άν*- which has been incorrectly separated from its verb:

Plato, *Phil.* 16 c:²

πάντα γὰρ ὅσα τέχνης ἐχόμενα ἀνηυρέθη πάποτε, διὰ ταύτης (sc. ὁδοῦ)
φανερὰ γέγονε.

(ἀνηυρέθη edd. ἀνευρέθη B *άν* εὔρεθῃ W *άν* εὔρεθῃ T)

Plat. *Timaios* 63 c:³

—πάντ' ἐναντία καὶ πλάγια καὶ πάντως διάφορα πρὸς ἄλληλα ἀνευρεθήσεται
γιγνόμενα καὶ ὄντα—

(ἀνευρεθήσεται edd. *άν* εὔρεθήσεται codd.)

The error seems to be explained by a feeling on the part of later Greeks that *άν*- in this verb is redundant. Cf. Suidas as cited by Sturz⁴ s.v. *ἀνευρίσκειν* 1 (vol. 1, p. 234): *ἀνεῦρον*—ἢ ἀνὰ πρόθεσις χάριν κόσμου κεῖται.

The elegance which has universally recommended the correction we propose in the Plato passages will be a recommendation in our Xenophon passage as well. No letters need be changed or dropped. It is only necessary to write the words together which now stand separately, and the brackets which regularly disfigure this page can be dispensed with. The new text will then be: *Ἐγὼ δὲ οὕτω μὲν πολλὰ ἔχω ὥς μόλις αὐτὰ καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ἀνευρίσκω.*

University of Zürich

GUY L. COOPER

¹ Not only with *εὐρίσκειν* is there confusion between *άν* the modal adverb and *άν*- the prepositional prefix. The same confusion occurs for example with other verbs at Hes. *Erg.* 131; Pind. *Nem.* 7. 68 and Plat. *Leg.* 712 c.

² The reading of B *ἀνευρέθη* is impossible because the subjunctive without *άν* is irregular in dependent sentences in Attic (KG 2. 426. 1). The reading of W *άν* εὔρεθῃ is impossible because that would be a potential of the past or an *irrealis* and neither would give a good sense. The reading of T *άν* εὔρεθῃ is unlikely because the position of *άν*, which usually attaches itself to the relative, while not absolutely impossible—cf. Gildersleeve-Miller. 466—is highly irregular.

³ *άν* εὔρεθήσεται is unlikely because Attic avoids *άν* with the future (KG 1. 209).

⁴ Frid. Guil. Sturz, *Lexicon Xenophonticum*, Olms, Hildesheim, 1964 (Reprographischer Nachdruck der Ausgabe Leipzig, 1801). This feeling on the part of the scribes leads naturally also to confusion between the compound and the simple form of the verb in passages where *άν*- is *not* retained as being the modal particle *άν*. So we find for instance at Xen. *Cyrop.* 1. 6. 40 that only D and F have *ἀνηύρισκον*, whereas CAEGR and H have *εὐρίσκον*. In this case it may even be that the simplex is correct and the compound verb a well-intended correction. The simplex is used in the very close parallel at Xen. *Mem.* 3. 11. 8 and in this passage there is no variant in any manuscript.